



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,282	03/25/2004	Reinhold Burr	228181/BEHR	6041
23548 7590 04/29/2008 LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD 700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960				
EXAMINER				
KOSANOVIC, HELENA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3749				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,282

Applicant(s)

BURR ET AL.

Examiner

HELENA KOSANOVIC

Art Unit

3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 18-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 18-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/11/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendments filed 3/11/2008 are acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 18, 22-26 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Guillemin 4,947,735.

Guillemin teaches the invention as claimed: a device (fig. 8) for ventilating passenger cabin in the car having at least one control valve 46a, 46b with at least one edge 88 overflowed with air that can be moved from first to second position (opened/closed) wherein overflow edges 88, have a changing cross sectional profile (90, 92a, 92b, fig. 8) for diverting at least a portion of the airflow into a plurality of airstreams dividing from the main flow direction, and having a plurality of flow bodies (col. 3, ll. 10-15, fig. 8) in the overflowed edge area, wherein the plurality of flow body comprising a turbulence generators (90, 92a, 92b) having a side facing airflow and being tapered on the side facing air flow (fig. 8, shows element 82a and 92b being tapered).

Regarding claim 18, the plurality of flow bodies is arranged at a predetermined angle (fig. 8) in relation to the overflowing edge area.

Regarding claim 22, the overflowed edge area includes a sealing edge (opposite the edge 88, fig. 8) that is capable of substantially closing an airflow path (fig. 7).

Regarding claims 23 and 30, the control valve includes reinforcing raised ligaments 50a, 50b, fig. 8).

Regarding claims 24 and 31, the invention further comprising a second control valve (figs 4-5, first control valve 46a and second valve 46b) and curvilinear baffle arranged adjacent to the first control valve and curvilinear baffle on the same rotational axis (48, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 25, a control mechanism (fig. 4 and 8) for use in a motor vehicle ventilation system, comprising: a substantially flat and curvilinear baffle 46a (figs, 4 and 8) mounted to an axis (48) and rotatable within an air flow path between an open position and closed position, wherein the baffle when rotated into the open position allows air flow within the path and when rotated into the closed position prevents air flow within the path; and a plurality of turbulence generators (90,92a, 92b, fig. 8) attached at a predetermined angle to at least one edge of the baffle the turbine generators having a side facing airflow and being tapered on the side facing the airflow (fig. 8, shows element 82a and 92b being tapered), wherein turbulence generators define flow pathways through which a portion of the air flowing over the edge of the baffle in a main flow direction may be diverted (col. 3, ll. 10-15).

Regarding claim 26, a control mechanism for use in a motor vehicle ventilation system (fig. 4, 7, 8), comprising: a substantially flat (plain 46a, 46b) and curvilinear (elements 50, 90, 92a, 92b) baffle mounted to an axis (84, fig. 8) and rotatable within an air flow path, which baffle includes a first sealing edge one side of the baffle opposite the second side 88) and a second sealing edge (88) that cooperate to substantially seal a flow path when the baffle is rotated into a closed position (fig. 7); and a plurality of turbulence generators (90, 92a, 92b) attached at a predetermined angle to the first sealing edge of the baffle, wherein the turbulence generators are tapered (fig. 8, shows element 82a and 92b being tapered).

Regarding claimed limitation that the flow bodies are selected from a group of structures comprising turbulence generators, pinnacles, calottes, spherical calottes, nubs, pyramids (claims 1, 25, 26) the courts have held that changes in shape is a matter of a design choice which the person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious absent persuasive evidence that a particular configuration of the flow body (in this case) was significant (see MPEP 2144.04 IV B). In this case changing the shape of elements 92a, 92b is a matter design choice since the Applicant has not disclosed that the claimed shape provides an advantage is used for particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the Applicant's invention to perform equally well with shape 92a, 92b or claimed, shape, because both shapes performs the function of guiding the air equally well (MPEP 2144.04 IV B) .

2. Claims 19-20 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guillemin 4,947,735.

Guillemin teaches the invention as discussed above, but is not specific about an angle.

Regarding the angle limitation the courts have held that where general condition of claim is disposed in the prior art (fig.1), it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable range (MPEP 2144.05 IIa). In this case unnumbered rising element is angled to some degree compared to plane 46a,b on figure 8, according to the court it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable range of angles.

3. Claims 21 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guillemin 4,947,735 in view of Kaszycki 2005/0170769.

Guillemin teaches the invention as discussed above but is not specific about overflowed edge made of injection molded.

Kaszycki expressly teaches injection molded piece forming an edge that is attached to the control door in the car (paragraph 0008).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an injected molded piece for the overflowed edge, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. (.See In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416. See also Ballas Liquidating Co. v. Allied industries of Kansas, Inc. (DC Kans) 205 USPQ 331. Also MPEP 2144.07).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/11/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant argument about to shape of turbulence generator,s the examiner applied design choice in order to reject newly amended claims, as discussed above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HELENA KOSANOVIC whose telephone number is (571)272-9059. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven McAllister can be reached on 571-272-6785. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3749

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 3749
042508

/Steven B. McAllister/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3749